

perhaps do their two years better than do some colleges. And a two-year "terminal" program is what it is—vocational, terminal. And a "community-cultural" program is only half of the college liberal arts program, even though the junior colleges sometimes do it better because compression of time requires more definite aims. Much "college" teaching would benefit by the definition and correlation of a librarian-dean of instruction, but do you see it in operation in that form at Dartmouth, or Swarthmore, or Macalester, or Pomona, for example?

All our libraries, both junior college and college, are somewhat in the position of a heavily loaded transcontinental passenger train: when the railway management puts on two engines (for the train must get through) but only one diner (passengers stand in line for food). A full-fledged library program must go along with the first-class college.—*Willis Kerr, Claremont Colleges Library, Claremont, Calif.*

*Report of a Survey of the University of Mississippi Library* for the University of Mississippi. By A. F. Kuhlman, assisted by Icko Iben. University, Mississippi, 1940. 164p. (Mimeographed)

AT THE REQUEST of Chancellor Butts, Dr. A. F. Kuhlman, assisted by Dr. Icko Iben, has prepared this report of a survey "to measure the adequacy of the (University of Mississippi) library as a means of attaining the objectives set in the teaching, research, and public service program of the university and to suggest ways and means for improving it." The report begins with "the economic resources of the state and the university" and "an outline of the essentials in an effective university library." These introductory chap-

ters are followed by chapters on book resources, physical plant and equipment, personnel, organization and administration, use, financial support, and government of the library. The report is well arranged and clearly presented for convenient use. Part I is a concise "Summary and Recommendations." Part II is the body of the report. The arrangement is helped by division of the statistical data into shorter tables in the text with longer ones at the end as appendices to the main work.

Library science profits from the fact that the authors of a survey must discover or create standards, set up comparative tables, and find and utilize "check lists," or "yardsticks," to test and measure the library under consideration. Unfortunately, this is a report on a weak institution in a very poor state. Consequently, the tables, lists, comparisons, and discussions to show its condition and needs seem at times a little like a highly complicated anti-aircraft gun set up where a fly swatter would do the trick. Precise survey methodology does not get a hard test in a survey of this collection of 67,000 volumes, in a large measure obsolete, and supported by annual appropriations of something like \$6,000 per year for the purchase of books. At the same time, one interested in survey techniques may wonder if the devices used would be enough to test and measure accurately the condition and needs of a better institution.

The report has a purpose, however, and for this it is well designed. It is thorough and detailed. It should serve as a sound basis for library development at the University of Mississippi for many years to come. The authors patiently point out the needs and recommend steps for improvement. These range from the pri-

mary factor of greatly increasing the library budget, to providing additional staff members, paying better salaries, remodelling the building—if a donor can not be found to provide a new one—reorganizing the management and control, and carefully developing the book resources to support adequately the university's program of instruction and research. The report suggests an additional purpose in the expressed hope that the university may obtain some "substantial help from sources outside of the state," since the "public revenues of the state are for the time being too limited" and the need is urgent and of more than local concern.—*Peyton Hurt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.*

*The Classified List of Periodicals for College Libraries;*

*The Classified List of Reference Books for College Libraries.* Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Birmingham, Alabama, 1940. 15p.; 40p. ea. \$1. (Mimeographed)

AT THE MIDWINTER MEETING of the A.C.R.L. Dean Brumbaugh of the North Central Association cautioned us against using book and periodical lists compiled by accrediting agencies for buying purposes. One cannot help but query why, if such lists can validly be used as testing tools, they should not also be used as book selection aids. Not that one would advocate blind adherence to the lists in question, but in representing the pooled judgments of experienced librarians, they are admirably suited not only for use by an accrediting agency in measuring the adequacy of a given library, but can also be used by the librarians of junior and four-

year colleges for a qualitative analysis of their own collections.

The periodicals list compiled under the direction of Guy R. Lyle and Virginia Trumper of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina is based on the 409 titles included in their *Classified List of Periodicals for the College Library* (2nd ed., 1938), which were ranked by the seventy-five librarians who cooperated in the project. The final list reflects their estimates of these titles and includes a few additional titles suggested by them. Arrangement is by the subjects in a college curriculum, with further subdivision into essential and desirable titles. Eighty-one titles suited to the junior college level are starred. The present reviewer doubts if forty-two periodicals in education are desirable for a liberal arts college, but this is the only list with which the reviewer disagrees seriously. On the whole the quality of selection is high and if a college library were to have all of the journals represented, faculty members and students would have access to a wide variety of material of current interest and future college generations provided with a record of the history and thought of our times.

The reference list, compiled under the chairmanship of Mrs. Frances Cheney, reference librarian of the Vanderbilt University Library of Nashville, is likewise the result of cooperative effort. It, too, is arranged by subject and subdivided into essential and desirable titles. Of the 778 titles, 305 are starred as essential for junior college libraries. In inclusiveness the list falls somewhere between Shores' *Basic Reference Books* and Mudge's *Guide to Reference Books*. Considerable ingenuity is shown in supplying general treatises for subjects for which adequate reference books are not available. In both lists